

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re application of:

Manfred Heisler et al.

Group Art Unit: 1797

Examiner: David L. Sorkin

Serial No.: 10/802,455

Filed: March 17, 2004

For: Process For The Continuous Preparation Of High-Viscosity  
Silicone Compositions

Attorney Docket No.: WAS 0627 PUS

**SUPPLEMENTAL AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111**

Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Enclosed herewith is a Rule 131 Declaration evidencing invention prior to the effective date of the *Mathur II* reference, U.S. Published Application No. 2003/0229175. The Declaration is supported by pages from the original Invention Disclosure filed in the Patent, Trademark and Licensing Department of the Assignee, Wacker Chemie AG, and attests to the fact that the examples found therein, an English translation of which may be found in the specification on pages 12 and 15, were performed in the laboratories of Wacker Chemie AG in Burghausen, Germany, a WIPO country, prior to February 27, 2003. Withdrawal of *Mathur II* as a reference is respectfully solicited.


Also enclosed is the Declaration of Dr. Johann Schuster under Rule 132 which is self-explanatory. As one skilled in the art, Dr. Schuster indicates that freedom from color causing impurities and a low volatiles content are highly important for HTV silicone rubbers. Dr. Schuster also testifies as to how one skilled in the art would interpret the teachings of the

*Mathur I* reference, and why one skilled in the art would not be motivated to replace the high speed, blade-type mixers of *Mathur I*, used to produce damp premix, with a kneading cascade.

Dr. Schuster also performed a comparative example, set forth in paragraph 7, where he attempted to produce an untreated premix so taught by *Mathur*, but employing a kneading cascade instead of the cutting-action mixers of *Mathur I*. The use of a kneading cascade failed in this application. Dr. Schuster also attests to the surprising and unexpected results obtained by the claimed invention, in paragraph 9, of the Declaration, and that one skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine *Mathur I* with *Schuster*, since the fillers they employ in their respective processes are diametrically opposed, and since *Mathur I* is directed to the technological field of HTV rubber, while *Schuster* is directed to LSR (liquid silicone rubber).

An allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
**Manfred Heisler et al.**

By   
William G. Conger  
Reg. No. 31,209  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: May 8, 2009

**BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.**  
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor  
Southfield, MI 48075-1238  
Phone: 248-358-4400  
Fax: 248-358-3351

Attachments: Rule 131 & Rule 132 Declarations